

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/687,614	HARADA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Surekha Vathyam	1753	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Surekha Vathyam.

(3) Juan Marquez.

(2) Alex Nogueroles.

(4) Mayumi Mori

Date of Interview: 25 July 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☒ Yes e) ☐ No.

If Yes, brief description: polyimide film burnt at it's end.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Zare of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Alb Nogueroles
Primary Art 1753

V. Surekha

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant showed evidence that with the technique of Zare to remove the polyimide, a right angle edge would be formed and not a tapered edge, although a tapered edge is suggested by fig. 4 of Zare. Examiner Noguerola suggested that applicants file this evidence in a declaration upon which the rejection based on Zare would be withdrawn if the declaration was found persuasive. However, applicant was informed that tapering of capillaries in general was already known at the time of the invention. Applicant was provided with copies of two articles that shows this. So even if rejection based on Zare is withdrawn, a new non-final rejection would likely be applied against claim 1. Applicant was also told to consider claiming a narrower angle range for the taper supported by the specification. Copies of the articles are from the following sources: Journal of High Resolution Chromatography and Chromatography Communications, A. Spark, vol. 9, August 1986, pages 481-482; Sigma-Aldrich article (downloaded from www.biosupplynet.com/cfdocs/protocols/200706_01.cfm).